

U.S. Appln. No. 09/901,273
Reply to Office Action dated June 10, 2005

PATENT
450117-03383

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of the application are respectfully requested in view of the amendments and remarks herewith, which place the application into condition for allowance. The present amendment is being made to facilitate prosecution of the application.

Do Not
Enter!
DHH

I. STATUS OF THE CLAIMS AND FORMAL MATTERS

Claims 1-19 are pending in this application. Claims 1 and 14 are hereby amended. Support for this amendment is provided throughout the Specification as originally filed. No new matter has been introduced by this amendment. Changes to claims are not made for the purpose of patentability within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. §101, §102, §103, or §112. Rather, these changes are made simply for clarification and to round out the scope of protection to which Applicants are entitled. The Examiner is thanked for indicating that claims 2-6, 9, 11 and 15-19 are allowable.

II. REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)

Claims 1, 7, 8, 10, and 12-14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as allegedly anticipated by U.S. 6,650,178 to Brankovic et al.

With respect to the Section 102 rejection, it is respectfully pointed out that a two-prong inquiry must be satisfied in order for a Section 102 rejection to stand. First, the prior art reference must contain all of the elements of the claimed invention. See *Lewmar Marine Inc. v. Barient Inc.*, 3 U.S.P.Q.2d 1766 (Fed. Cir. 1987). Second, the prior art must contain an enabling disclosure. See *Chester v. Miller*, 15 U.S.P.Q.2d 1333, 1336 (Fed. Cir. 1990). A reference